

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10 and 12 – 14 are pending and in consideration in the above-identified application, and Claims 4 and 11 were previously cancelled.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 – 14 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claims 1 and 8 are amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10 and 12 – 14 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1 - 14

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication No. 2002-15771, hereafter referred to as JP'771.

In relevant part, Claim 1 recites that:

“... The electrolytic solution contains a lithium salt that contains at least one selected from the group consisting of LiN (C₂F₅SO₂)₂, LiC (CF₃SO₂)₃, LiAlCl₄ and LiSiF₆.”

As stated by the Examiner JP'771 discloses an electrolyte solution that contains a LiClO₄ Lithium salt. However, JP'771 does not disclose an electrolyte salt that contains at least one selected from the group consisting of LiN (C₂F₅SO₂)₂, LiC (CF₃SO₂)₃, LiAlCl₄ and LiSiF₆.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over JP '771, as are dependent Claims 2 – 7, for at least the same reasons.

Independent Claim 8 recites the same distinguishable limitation as that of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 8 is patentable over JP'771, as are dependent claims 9 – 14, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1 - 14

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP'771 in view of Japanese Publication No. 2001-057234 (hereafter referred to as JP'234).

In addition to JP'771, JP'234 also fails to teach or suggest that the electrolytic solution contains a lithium salt that contains at least one selected from the group consisting of LiN(C₂F₅SO₂)₂, LiC(CF₃SO₂)₃, LiAlCl₄ and LiSiF₆.

Therefore, Claims 1 and 8 are patentable over JP'771 and JP'234, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are their corresponding dependent claims, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10 and 12 – 14 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Dated: July 10, 2008

By: David R. Metzger

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000